16/1/s/

June 7, 1952 Opinion No. 52-166

Mr. Warren L. McCarthy County Attorney Maricopa County Courthouse Phoenix, Arizona

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

On May 10, 1952, you addressed this office with the following inquiry:

"May the Housing Authority of Maricopa County purchase insurance from a mutual company?"

and in your letter, referred to an opinion of this office written July 25, 1933 to the effect that school districts may not insure in mutual companies. You also asked our opinion as to whether or not the Housing Authority is a political subdivision.

We wish to advise that it is the opinion of this office that the Housing Authority is a polltical subdivision.

Answering your primary question, you know that the parts of the Arizona constitutional and statutory law quoted in the opinion of July 25, 1933 are still in full force and effect. A search of our files reveals that since 1933, there have been two occasions when inquiry by a political subdivision about the purchase of mutual form of insurance has been addressed to this office and in both instances, this office reiterated the general principle that the contingent assessment burden of mutual insurance is objectionable.

In further research, we can find no Arizona State Supreme Court decision interpreting the constitutional and statutory laws above referred to in any connection with mutual insurance companies, let alone in the light of any given set of facts or any particular type of either assessable, nonassessable, or paid premium form of policy.

Mr. Warren L. McCarthy Maricopa County Attorney Phoenix, Arizona June 7, 1952 Opinion No. 52-166 Page two

We therefore confirm generally the 1933 opinion and hold that the Housing Authority of Maricopa County may not purchase insurance from a mutual company.

Returned herewith are the briefs and Public Housing Authority opinion sent with your letter.

Very truly yours,

FRED O. WIISON Attorney General

JAC:d

JOSEPH A. CROWE Assistant Attorney General

> gamon referred to are 51-101 and 51-232